



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/676,572

09/30/2003

Stuart D. Cheshire

APL-P3153

7890

62096

7590

12/30/2010

PVF -- APPLE INC.

c/o PARK, VAUGHAN, FLEMING & DOWLER LLP

2820 FIFTH STREET

DAVIS, CA 95618-7759

EXAMINER

HAMZA, FARUK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2442

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/30/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/676,572	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHESHIRE, STUART D.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FARUK HAMZA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-9,13-16,21-24,35-37 and 41-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8,9,16,17,24,35-37 and 41-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7,13-15 and 21-23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is response to the pre-appeal conference held on November 18, 2010. Applicant's election without traverse of species I (claims 1, 5-8, 9, 13-16, 21-24, 35-37 and 41-43 in the reply filed on April 08, 2010 is acknowledged. Claim 40 has been canceled. Claims 1, 5-8, 9, 13-16, 21-24, 35-37 and 41-43 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 5-8, 9, 13-16, 21-24, 35-37 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1, it recites "a second client" in line 3. There is no claim limitation of "a first client". It is not clear to the examiner how second client exist when there is no first client.

As to claim 1, it recites "a multicast response" in line 5. It also recites "a multicasted response" in line 8. It is unclear to the examiner whether these are referring to the same multicast response.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the multicast query" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 9 and 17 also have same deficiency. All the dependent claims have same deficiency of their base claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 3.** Claims 1, 8, 9, 16-17, 24 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danknick (U.S. Patent Number 6,021,429) hereinafter referred as Danknick and in view of Eatough et al. (US Pub. No 2003/0050955) hereinafter referred as Eatough.

As to claim 1, Danknick teaches a method for invalidating a resource record in a local cache at a client computer system within a network, comprising:  
receiving a message from a second client querying a device; locating a second resource record associated with the second device; waiting for a response to the multicast query; and if after a pre-determined number of queries the response to the query is not received in the pre-determined amount of time, invalidating the second resource record (Column 8, lines 1-Column 9, lines 8).

Danknick does not explicitly teach the claim limitation of multicast message.

However, Eatough teaches the claim limitation of multicast message (P[0035]).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Danknick by incorporating Eatough's teaching of multicast message. Motivation to do so comes from the knowledge well known in the art that multicast deliver information to a group of destinations simultaneously using the most efficient strategy to deliver the messages over each link of the network only once, creating copies only when the links to the multiple destinations split.

As to claim 8, Danknick teaches the method of claim 41, wherein the resource records are retrieved and the queries are issued at a pre-specified time interval (Column 3, lines 7-12).

As to claim 41, Danknick teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises: retrieving a resource record from the local cache at the client computer system; issuing one or more queries for the resource record at the client computer system; waiting for a response to the query at the client computer system; and if the response to the query is not received in a pre-determined amount of time and after issuing a predetermined number of queries for the resource record, invalidating the resource record at the client computer system (Column 13, lines 65-Column 14, lines 13).

Claims 9, 16-17, 24 and 42-43 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claims 1, 8, 35 and 41. Therefore, claims 9, 16-17, 24 and 42-43 are rejected for similar reasons.

Art Unit: 2442

4. Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danknick and in view of Eatough and further in view of George (U.S. Patent Number 7,143,108) hereinafter referred as George.

As to claim 35, Danknick teaches invalidating resource record.

Danknick and Eatough do not explicitly teach the claim limitation of invaliding a child resource record of the resource record.

However, George teaches the claim limitation of invaliding a child resource record of the resource record (abstract).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined teaching of Danknick and Eatough by incorporating George's teaching of nullification and deletion of child record because that would enable the system to provide customizable deletion mechanism.

Claims 36 and 37 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 35. Therefore, claims 36 and 37 are rejected for similar reasons.

**Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its

Art Unit: 2442

entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 5-7, 13-15, 21-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 2442

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is 571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll –free).

Faruk Hamza

Primary Examiner

Group Art Unit 2442

/Faruk Hamza/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442



Application/Control Number: 10/676,572  
Art Unit: 2442

Page 8